



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

GENERAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

ANNUAL MEETING

The fifth annual meeting of the Association was held at the Johns Hopkins Club, Baltimore, on Saturday, December 28, at 10 o'clock, preceded by meetings of the Council and of Committee V (Apparatus for Productive Scholarship) on Friday evening.

At the morning session, in the absence of a report from Committee U (on Patriotic Service) delayed in transmission, the Secretary reported on the work and plans of the American Council on Education, on which he had served as the representative of the Association.

A report was presented from Committee O (Requirements for Ph.D. Degree), and is printed on page 12 of this issue. It was voted that the Committee be requested to report on the practicability of a clear qualitative differentiation between work required for the Master's degree and that for the Doctor's degree, and it was further voted that the Committee be requested also to report on the question of what credit, if any, should be given for extension work and for research work in industrial laboratories.

Committee R (Promotion of Research in Colleges and Universities) presented an extended report, which will be published in a later issue of the BULLETIN.

Chairman Leighton of Committee T (Place and Functions of University Faculties) made an informal report of progress.

It was voted that the Council for 1919 prepare a draft of a constitutional amendment in regard to delegate representation of local branches, to be submitted to the branches for discussion during the year. In connection with this motion it was suggested that branches elect any number of delegates but that voting power be proportional to membership in branches, also that meetings remain open to all members of the Association with opportunity for free discussion.

At the afternoon session Chairman Stone of Committee P (on Pensions and Insurance) presented an extended report, which appears on page 19 of this issue. It was voted that the report be accepted and approved and the recommendations adopted.

Vice-Chairman Teggart of Committee V (on Apparatus for Productive Scholarship) reported a comprehensive plan for systematic bibliographical work in humanistic branches, supplemented by

monographs and handbooks prepared with the co-operation of the special societies for the different branches.

It was voted that the Association approve the plan for an index of current literature in humanistic sciences and authorize the Executive Committee to make the necessary arrangements with the H. W. Wilson Company, if upon further consideration by the Executive Committee and Committee V, this seems desirable.

Professor Bingham of Lafayette College presented an announcement in regard to the formation of the American Metric Association, inviting members interested in its objects to communicate with him at Easton, Pennsylvania, or with Professor Howard Richards, Secretary of the American Metric Association, 156 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

Professor More (Cincinnati) presented the proposed declaration of principles published in the November-December BULLETIN. It was voted to refer the matter to a special committee on the formulation of guiding principles for the conduct of higher education in the United States.

A special committee on the case of Dr. J. M. Cattell presented a report which was accepted and approved (see page 43).

The Nominating Committee having requested permission to make certain amendments in its report as published in the November-December BULLETIN, the following officers were elected:

President, A. O. Lovejoy (Philosophy), Johns Hopkins University; Vice-President, H. A. Aikins (Philosophy), Western Reserve University; Secretary, H. W. Tyler (Mathematics), Massachusetts Institute of Technology; members of the Council for the term ending December 31, 1921; Florence Bascom (Geology), Bryn Mawr College; F. W. Blackmar (Sociology and Economics), University of Kansas; Henry Crew (Physics), Northwestern University; B. M. Duggar (Botany), Washington University; Harold Jacoby (Astronomy), Columbia University; H. C. Lancaster (French), Amherst College; O. G. Libby (History), University of North Dakota; E. S. Meany (History), University of Washington; J. S. P. Tatlock (English), Stanford University; R. M. Wenley (Philosophy), University of Michigan.

It was voted to express approval of the general principle of establishing a league of nations for the maintenance of peace.

COUNCIL BUSINESS.—The Council voted to recommend an amendment changing the length of service required for membership in the Association from ten to five years; also an amendment

making the term of office of the President and of the Secretary two years, with the understanding that so far as may be convenient these terms shall be arranged to expire in alternate years.

Voted to appoint as the Executive Committee of the Council for 1919, the President, Messrs. Coulter, Hancock, Jacoby, Pound, Salmon and the Secretary; also to appoint Messrs. Cohen and Coulter to serve with the Secretary as representatives of the Association in the American Council on Education.

EXTRACTS FROM THE STENOGRAPHIC REPORT OF THE ANNUAL MEETING

Professor Lovejoy: The disadvantages of the present meeting are obvious to everybody. The character of the votes of the Association now depends upon the chance make-up of the attendance at any annual meeting. The meetings have been fairly representative in character and somewhat representative of all sections of the country, but it is perfectly possible that in the future we may get a snap vote on some important matters. That, we should, if possible, avert.

The kind of plan I should be inclined to favor would be one by which local branches were allowed in the annual meeting a vote proportional to their membership, say, one vote for every 25 members, or something of that sort; that vote to be cast as a unit by any one or more representatives of that branch whom they might send to the meeting. We should, I think, have a larger number of delegates than we have of the members when we have a meeting of the entire membership. I should also wish the annual meeting to be open to all members with full privilege of taking part in the discussion.

Such a plan would have a desirable vivifying influence upon the local branches themselves; it will at least compel them to meet for some rather important business once every year and will presumably bring a good many of them together to discuss the principal questions of the coming annual meeting of the Association before they select their delegates to go to that meeting.

I do not, however, wish to incorporate in my motion any suggestion to the Council as to the plan to recommend. The purpose of the motion is merely to direct the Council to draw up *some* plan and

to lay it before all of the local branches, that they may vote upon it before the next annual meeting.

Colonel Wigmore: Mr. President, I wish to express hearty sentiments of assent to the proposal made by the gentleman from Johns Hopkins University and I wish there were some way of bringing it more speedily to a vote of the association as an amendment to the constitution.

There is no doubt that the original method of a personal annual meeting for this association is a genial failure. It is absurd that fifty people should represent two or three thousand. The vote cannot carry weight.

Now, there are three ways of consolidating and ventilating the public opinion of this body. One is the usual way, viz., in an annual personal mass meeting. The second way is the delegate way, the representative way, as is proposed in that amendment. I would like to see that tried. But there is a third way, and that third way can be partially used at the same time, and it ought to be used more than it is. That is the method of correspondence. It may interest you, and probably is a novelty to all here to know that one of the most enormous tasks of the war, on this side of the water, viz., the national draft, was accomplished by one man sitting at his desk and giving orders, writing letters and sending telegrams, while thirty-five thousand workers, (not to include about 150,000 more who worked a part of the time, but 35,000 men who worked day and night), executed those orders; they never saw the man that gave the orders, yet they worked as one body.

That instance illustrates how a national body can be governed by correspondence. I am a great believer in managing an association by correspondence. All it needs is a little money and continuous effort. In my opinion this association could be managed on the correspondence plan. If the entire draft was managed by correspondence, anything else can be. National associations of a scientific and professional nature should use the correspondence idea in their work far more copiously than they do. The delegate method and the correspondence method should go hand in hand.

Professor Leighton (as chairman of Committee T): The work that we have been engaged upon for the past year has been chiefly that of collecting information in regard to two matters—first, what are the legal powers and rights of faculties in university government and administration; secondly, what is the actual practice. This

latter is really the important matter, and that is the matter on which it is extremely difficult to get frank and full information. Let me give you an instance, from Ohio. Some years ago, a question arose in regard to a matter involving property. The Supreme Court of Ohio decided that the Board of Trustees of the Ohio State University is not a corporation. That is a legal decision, and I believe similar decisions were made in other states. Therefore, it is not subject to the laws governing corporations, it is an agency of state, not subject to the same conditions of contract as a corporation would be.

When we come to the question of what is the actual practice, let me give you one or two interesting things that have developed, showing that this situation is really an acute one, in many cases. A professor who is well-known in his own field as a competent teacher and as a good scholar, in a university which is also well-known and has been for many years a member of the Association of American Universities, gave the information which he gave to me on the distinct understanding that his name was not to be mentioned in the report and there was to be no indication to show from what source I got this information about the institution.

I asked a member to collect information of this sort in regard to women's colleges. After receiving the information which had been collected, I wrote: "I notice that the information in regard to the actual practice is meager. It is possible that in asking for this information you did not emphasize the desirability of getting reports of actual practice." The reply was that this had been emphasized and that the persons written to in these cases were very reluctant to give the information, on the ground that it might damage them.

It is very obvious of course that it is impossible for us to make any recommendations in regard to the proper functions of faculties without formulating a conception of the proper functions of the board of trustees and of the president.

Now, in theory, the president represents the faculty to the board of trustees, and I have never met a president, or talked with a president—and I have talked with a number about this matter—who did not say he regarded himself primarily as the executive agent of the faculty; and on the other hand, I have never heard of a faculty of a large institution in which I could not find members who would say that the president did not represent them.

The situation with regard to the organization of American uni-

versities, let me sum it up in a few words, is an utter anachronism. The board of trustees is, in theory, a despotic body,—as far as the faculty is concerned—it can do anything it pleases. The reality is something very different. It is composed of busy men. The whole board may meet three or four times a year, or once a month; and in the vast majority of cases, all the board of trustees does in any given institution is to approve the recommendations of the president. And it doesn't ask whether the president's recommendations represent the sentiment of the faculty.

On the other hand, the president, who regards himself theoretically as the representative of the faculty, is bombarded constantly by all sorts of missiles from without—the alumni want this, special interests want something else. It very rarely happens that anybody outside the university or even anybody of the alumni in proposing some change in the university, ever thinks of consulting the faculty.

Professor Bennett: Mr. President, is there any way of receiving and referring the voted opinions of the branches of the Association on the matters brought up—as this matter for instance—of the part of the faculty in the government of colleges?

The Secretary: Mr. President, the BULLETIN publishes news from local branches. When expressions of opinion come in from a local branch on matters pending before committees, the procedure is presumably to forward such expressions of opinion to the chairmen of the committees, so that they will not be published in advance of the committee reports.

Professor Leighton: May I say in answer to the inquiry, that the committee would welcome very heartily expressions of opinion. We have tried to get expressions of opinion and we have gotten them in the case of many branches at places where we have members on the committee, but even there in some cases the branches have been so inert that they have not taken the trouble to express an opinion. We are pretty inert; I don't know whether it is because we are by nature a timid lot, or because we have been intimidated by existing situations or whether we are too busy about other things, but it is extremely difficult to get members of local branches to get together and thresh these things out.

Professor Bennett: I understand, then, that it is not desired that the voted opinions of branches be announced in open meeting.

The Secretary: I referred rather to publishing the opinions in the printed BULLETIN. I personally see no reason why oral opinions

shouldn't be presented either from individuals or from local branches.

Professor Bennett: I should like to say, then, that the Union College branch of this Association voted the expression of opinion "that the educational policy of the college should be under the control of the faculty," and we should like to have that suggestion fully considered. The branch also desires the Association to consider the question of having faculties represented on boards of trustees, and "represented" does not mean represented by the president of the college; it means represented by a member, or members, of the faculty other than the president.

This resolution was referred to Committee T.

Professor Ullman: It seems to me we are arriving at the really vital point. The trustees are uninformed and they need to be enlightened. It seems to me that a good many of our reports should go to the trustees. With the permission of Mr. J. P. Munroe, and the "Science" Press, we reprinted Mr. Munroe's article on "Closer Relation between Trustees and Faculties," which appeared some years ago in *Science*, and sent copies of it to all members of the board of trustees. We have no reaction whatever so far, but we are hopeful. I think if this Association would circulate other material of similar type to members of the boards of trustees, that in time they would begin to see the problems as we see them.

Professor Eaton: The local branches have a great deal to do and they have not yet discovered what that part is. There is friendship between faculty members and certain members of the boards of trustees; a great deal of propaganda can be carried on and trustees can be enlightened. It seems to me we ought to have a committee to help the local branches define their work.

Professor Leighton: This question is an extremely important one. There would be no guarantee that the trustees would read the publications of this Association if they were sent to them directly, but most of us know trustees in our own institutions. It is our business, individually and as members of branches, to let them know what we are doing.

A Visitor: It seems to me in pondering this whole question of the relation between the faculties and boards that at the present juncture—just at the close of a war which has demonstrated, as it has never been demonstrated before, the importance of coöperative effort along every line—it would be precisely the thing for this Association to try to carry out the idea of securing, in as large a

number of institutions as possible, an actual physical conference, between faculties and boards for the discussion of well-matured problems of university life. One main problem is this problem of relations between boards and faculties, the status of faculties, etc., but there are a good many other problems which, in the beginning of this reconstructive era, ought of course to come in.

Professor More: (Opening the discussion on the Proposed Declaration of Principles): Mr. Chairman and Members of the Association, from the very beginning of the American Association of University Professors I have been very keenly interested, personally, in its future. There seemed to be a chance to do something that heretofore has always failed in academic circles, and that is to get some central body of opinions and principles which would not only carry weight with the boards of directors and executives of our colleges, but also would unite us in carrying out certain principles.

Now the college presidents who have talked to me about the American Association of University Professors, looked upon its foundation with some dread; they felt that it was to be a more or less organized body to do things which would make our colleges more truly educational and less merely vocational institutions. I think the executives of our colleges are getting more and more of the opinion (and are settling back more and more comfortably in their chairs) that we are going to spend our efforts in local issues. In considering the various colleges in this country, each has its own local problems and if we attempt in any way to act on local issues we become segregated and controversial, and we obtain nothing. The great tendency of a reform body is to allow each reformer to carry out his ideas; when this happens the mutual controversies which arise prevent the acceptance of any general plan of improvement in essential things. How are the local branches to know what the general Association stands for, what the local Association desires, and what it can possibly accomplish? So far that has been done through committee work. The average college professor will study, but he will not carry in mind the deductions of all these committees. Consequently, when the local branches meet there are not definite questions for them to keep in mind for their year's work, to promote the interests of the Association. Now it seemed to me that if some one could draw up a set of simple principles, which this Association, its members and local branches, could unite upon, then each local branch would have something

definite before it, on which it could act, on which it could report back to the general Association what it had accomplished in these various departments, and that if those principles could be drawn up by a committee as a short résumé and sent out each year, then we would have embodied gradually increasing information as to how the principles of this Association were progressing.

Nominating Committee.—The President has appointed the following committee to present nominations for officers at the next annual meeting: E. G. Conklin (Princeton), *Chairman*, E. R. Hedrick (Missouri), J. H. Latané (Johns Hopkins), E. L. Nichols (Cornell), L. J. Richardson (California).